

# Valley Center Community Planning Group

## Minutes for the October 17, 2011 Meeting

**Chairman: Oliver Smith; Vice Chairman: Ann Quinley; Secretary: Steve Hutchison**

7:00 pm at the Valley Center Community Hall; 28246 Lilac Road, Valley Center CA 92082

A=Absent/Abstain A/I=Agenda Item BOS=Board of Supervisors DPLU=Department of Planning and Land Use IAW=In Accordance With N=Nay  
P=Present R=Recuse SC=Subcommittee TBD=To Be Determined VCCPG=Valley Center Community Planning Group Y=Yea

Forwarded to Members: 1 November 2011

Approved: 14 November 2011

**1.**

**Call to Order and Roll Call by Seat #:**

**07:06 PM**

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15
A N D E R S O N	H U T C H I S O N	H O F L E R	G L A V I N I C	B R I T S C H	F R A N C K	Q U I N L E Y	V I C K	L E W I S	N J O O R H W N O S O O D N	S M I T H	J A C K S O N	R U D O L F	D A V I S	B A C H M A N
P	P	P	A	A	P	P	P	P	A	P	P	A	P	P

**Notes: all absences noticed**

**Quorum Established: 11 present**

**Pledge of Allegiance**

**2.**

**Approval of Minutes: September 12, 2011**

**Motion: Move to approve Minutes of September 12, 2011, as corrected**

**Maker/Second: Quinley/Lewis**

**Carries/Fails (Y-N-A): 8-0-3 Voice**

**3.**

**Open Forum:**

Deb Hofler provides an update on two solar projects proposed for Valley Center. She says next month VCCPG will vote on two solar projects, one, Solar Orchard between Vesper and Valley Center Road, the other at Cool Valley Rd. and Cole Grade Rd. These are two different types of projects and the planning group should expect to see more projects like them. Hofler reviewed solar technology including 3 types of solar Voltaic [SV] media: rigid cells, thin film cells and concentrating medium on cells, each with differing characteristics for recyclability, toxicity, fire risk and cost. Systems can be fixed-position or tracking types. The transmission lines that carry the generated power are limiting as to how much power can be carried. The County and State want to see smaller solar systems serving local areas. The County and State expect them to be located close to residential areas and electrical substations. County permits are administrative for personal use systems. Personal systems are net-metered for zero net production. If the owner is selling power from the system, the permit is discretionary. A system occupying 10-acres or more requires a major use permit and under 10-acres, a discretionary administrative permit. Both of the present system requests are discretionary and one requires a major use permit and the other an administrative permit. There is a formal review process. Such systems should be minimally disruptive and blend with surroundings [think screening]. They can be on flood plains or over septic systems. The County prohibits glare from solar panels. Transmission lines will limit the development of such systems unless the transmission capacity is increased. Major use permits require decommissioning plans. Even for administrative permits VCCPG can ask for screening and a decommissioning plan.

Vick asks about economies of scale and if a 10-acre system can be profitable. Chris Brown, an applicant, says contracts with SDG&E determine profitability. Small systems are for local distribution. Large systems [such as those in the desert] require distribution over large transmission lines.

Kerry Christiansen, a resident near the proposed system on Vesper Road, presents information on the impact to real estate values for residents nearby. She says panels are 8-11 feet tall, and with many surrounding homes being two stories, screening will have little benefit. She expressed her desire to remain in an agricultural neighborhood without industrial uses next door.

**4.**

**Discussion Items**

**4.a.**

**Summary of September 22, 2011 workshop at DPLU on Board Policy 1-63 (PAA process) update or sunset. (Smith)**

Oliver Smith presents. He reminds that Policy I-63 is a process for developing plan amendment authorizations [PAA]. Not all communities have this process. Talked about alternatives: do nothing;

	sunset current policy entirely; adopt the DPLU-presented August 3 <sup>rd</sup> redline proposal that is consistent with GPU; keep the current policy, but allow the DPLU director to intervene; keep the current policy but have an administratively approved option and a major-use discretionary option. Most PAAs are ultimately approved. The major concerns with the present policy are that the planning groups have a short time to respond, there is a lack of findings, the policy is too vague, the presentations are too piecemeal. There are several other concerns as well. Another dislike is that the PAA process is redundant with the general plan amendment process, so why have it? Also, appeals of the process results are available only to requestors. There were several groups and developers present. The PAA process presently requires conformance to community plans and the General Plan.		
4.b.	<b>Summary of October 13, 2011 workshop at DPLU for an optional design review process that will be available to less complex projects with a “B” designator. The process will consist of a checklist with specific design requirements. (Smith)</b> Smith presents and asks the question, is there any B-designator project that could benefit from a streamlined process? One obvious response was to have the applicants meet with the community planning group and determine if the project fits with community desires. Many developers were present. The intent is that design guidelines be followed. Nine areas of the County have strong design review boards, including Valley Center.		
4.c.	Smith announces award for Lael Montgomery’s work on Heritage Trail. Vick adds that it’s a shame that earlier planning group didn’t require a landscaped median in the South Village. Asks for ideas on how to use CCC buildings on surplus state land now open for bid. Asbestos is an issue.		
5.	<b>Action Items:</b>		
5.a.	<b>Presentation by Bob Citrano of DPLU on the Community Evacuation Routes Study Group and consultants report about proposed evacuation routes and standards. Discussion and possible vote on the presentation and the standards (Hutchison)</b>		
Discussion: Hutchison presents the Community Evacuation Routes Study overview and preliminary result. The study, funded by the County and executed by consultant Fehr and Peers, is a two-tiered selection process that combined suggestions from a stakeholder committee, comprised of community representatives and County staff, and data from GIS sources and site reviews. It is intended to designate potential new evacuation routes that would augment the existing County public road network and the minimum construction standards needed by those routes. Fourteen suggested routes were evaluated in the Tier 1 review using engineering feasibility, implementation constraints, significant environmental effects, and compatibility with the updated County General Plan as criteria. Eleven of those routes were considered in Tier 2, using the criteria of evacuation benefits/effectiveness, engineering constraints, environmental compatibility, and conceptual construction costs. The Tier 2 review resulted in the six final routes listed in the table below:			
<b>Composite Score</b>	<b>Corridor</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Conceptual Construction est. (\$ M)</b>
14	8	Mountain Meadow to Valley Center Rd	\$2.8
13	1B	Old Castle to Mirar De Valle	\$4.7
13	3	West Lilac to Cole Grade	\$11.1
12	2	Cole Grade to Lilac	\$3.4
12	11	Pauma Heights to Vesper	\$2.2
11	14	Paradise Mtn. to Guejito Rd.	\$6.1
		Total	\$30.3
Bob Citrano follows with additional clarification of funding for study and how the study will help to advance the development of the proposed routes. He notes that while no funding presently exists, this study will augment			

applications for construction grants from state and federal sources. Oliver Smith notes that all evacuation routes must be public roads. The County cannot depend on locked gates on private roads being opened for an emergency. Are there alternatives to County standard roads? The County is investigating. All of the routes will cost money to construct. How will they be paid for? Smith suggests that federal funds such as the TARP/Stimulus funds target shovel-ready projects and this study makes the designated routes more ready. Smith addresses a question about corridor 12 and why it was eliminated from the final list because its evacuation benefits and effectiveness did not score very high. Vick asks about evacuation to Escondido, specifically the grade choke point at Lake Wolford Rd and Valley Center Rd. He thinks it should have a high priority. Smith says it's an Escondido issue and Escondido doesn't think it is a priority. Vick thinks we should explore alternatives by using cones to relane the grade during emergency evacuations. Smith asks Citrano about a solution. Citrano suggests using TIF funds to improve the roadway at that point, or make the grade one-way during emergencies. Smith responds that the road must have one lane going in for emergency vehicles. Jackson suggests Smith make it an issue for the Fire Board. Davis suggests making the traffic issue a future issue for Highway Patrol, and the Fire Board. Sandy Smith, Vice-chair of Mobility SC, asks about secondary routes, suggesting there shouldn't be two tiers of priority for evacuation routes as suggested by the study. Lewis asks about the advantage of having two tiers of priorities. Citrano responds that priorities will help get funding. Tom Bumgardner, resident, asks about using Hidden Meadows' Transportation Impact Fees [TIF] for corridor 8 given their dependence on Valley Center for schools. S. Smith says VC and Hidden Meadows TIF fees are going to regional projects like Hwy 76.

**Motion:** Move that VCCPG accept and endorse that:

1. The County establish all 10 of the corridor routes reviewed in Tier 2 CERS [ref. figure 5.2 Fehr & Peers, 20 July 2011] on all future circulation planning documents and promote funding of these routes as public roads with a priority ranking established by the Mobility Subcommittee and Valley Center Community Planning Group
2. The County work to secure near term funding to further refine site-specific cost estimates, evaluate the acquisition costs of rights-of-way, and secure longer range funding to further advance implementation and construction of County public roads within the proposed corridors.
3. VCCPG offers to continue to work with the County to develop improved data driven metrics that effectively ration scarce road construction funding for the 10 competing candidate routes.
4. The County, its staff and consultants are to be commended for their professional efforts to date on the CERS project and the VCCPG looks forward to moving this project to the implementation stage.

**Maker/Second:** Hutchison/Quinley

**Carries/Fails (Y-N-A):** 11-0-0 Voice

**5.b.**

**28404 Cole Grade Rd (South of Valley Center Rd.) APN 188-260-37-00, Discussion and possible vote on presentation and request from Jerry Gaughan regarding changing zoning on his property from RR-4 to M54. (Smith)**

**Discussion:** Continued

**5.c.**

**Discussion and vote on Mobility Subcommittee recommendations for use of \$425,000 for Valley Center Road safety improvements. (Davis)**

**Discussion:** Davis presents that a tremendous effort by the Mobility SC, Bob Goralka [DPW staff] and Sandy Smith, resulted in a prioritized list of projects that he then reviews [appended at bottom of minutes]. He says that all the ideas generated will remain on the list for future consideration. However, the funds are limited and not all ideas can be implemented presently. The ideas span the full length of Valley Center Road from the Grade to Lake Wolford Rd. Hofler asks about #8 for clarification. Davis reviews it. Vick asks Bob Citrano, DPLU [present for another item], about additional VCCPG input for implementation. Vick questions priorities and suggests that maybe more items on the list could be implemented with current funds. Hutchison clarifies how priorities were set. Hofler says DPW typically provides design review. O. Smith reports that Glavinic supports motion and list in an email sent before the meeting, and S. Smith concurs.

**Motion:** Move to accept recommendations in the attached list [appended at bottom of minutes] according to priorities in list. Also, we ask DPW for the opportunity for further input at the design stage in order to review the design before implementation.

**Maker/Second:** Davis/Vick

**Carries/Fails (Y-N-A):** 11-0-0 Voice

5.d.	Discussion and vote on Approval of Valley Center Parks & Recreation District's Proposed Five Year Projects Priority List for the Expenditure of Park Land Dedication Ordinance Funds. (Bachman)	
<b>Discussion:</b> Doug Johnsen, Manager, Valley Center Parks & Recreation, discusses 2011-2012 Park Land Dedication Ordinance funds [PLDO] project priorities: 1. Adams Park Pool, an ADA-compliant pool lift; new energy-efficient pool pumps [\$20K] 2. Community Hall, purchase/installation of new fire-suppression hood for new commercial stove in kitchen [\$5K] 3. Adams Park, purchase and installation of a new playground structure [\$10K] 4. Scibilia Field, purchase and installation of new booster pump for irrigation system [\$2K]. He also described several goals for the 2011-2012 year that had to do with increasing funding and expanding facilities and programs to promote the health and well being of children, adults and seniors.		
<b>Motion:</b> Approve projects and funding as presented		
<b>Maker/Second:</b> Bachman/Quinley		<b>Carries/Fails (Y-N-A): 11-0-0 Voice</b>
5.e.	<b>Stephens Wind Turbines Administrative Permit 3000 11-006 (AD); the project is an administrative permit to allow five 48-inch diameter, roof mounted wind turbines or fans pursuant to Section 6950 of the Zoning Ordinance. It is located at 26904 Delridge Lane in Valley Center. Staff recommends that the Director of Planning and Land Use adopt the environmental findings and approve Administrative Permit AD 11-006 which includes findings necessary to ensure that the project is consistent with the Zoning Ordinance. (Bachman)</b>	
<b>Discussion:</b> Bachman presents a quick update for information purposes, no action required as it was approved in April 2011.		
5.f.	<b>Administrative Permit for Guest living quarters at Richard Voth Property, 3000-110125 (AD11-024); project located at 30727 Lilac Hills Lane, Contact person: Marty Diaz, 308 Industrial Way, Fallbrook 92028 (Jackson)</b>	
<b>Discussion:</b> Jackson presents a request for an administrative waiver for a now complete room addition over the Voth's barn. The structure, as built, is 580 sq. ft., under the County limit of 600 sq. ft. but in excess of the mandated limited of 30% of the primary dwelling [480 sq. ft.] and requires an administrative waiver. The facility is built and has no design issues, it is compatible with the community, and there are no environmental concerns. Jackson canvassed neighbors and got one favorable input from an adjoining property owner and no unfavorable input.		
<b>Motion:</b> Move that administrative waiver be approved		
<b>Maker/Second:</b> Jackson/Quinley		<b>Carries/Fails (Y-N-A): 11-0-0 Voice</b>
5.g.	<b>Discussion and possible vote on VCCPG supporting properties along Cole Grade Rd. south of Valley Center Road in changing zoning from RR-4 to M54 (Smith)</b>	
<b>Discussion:</b> Gerry Gaughan put up a sign for RV storage at his property on Cole Grade Rd. The County changed the zoning on his and adjacent properties from M-54 to RR-4 because of the flood plain issue. The County has noted the need for an impound yard for stolen cars that seem to be appearing regularly in the local casino parking lots. The County wants the impound yard close to the impound sites. The sheriff needs two bids for the impound yard contract and has only one bid in VC presently. Gaughan wants to pursue open storage for the impound yard. An impound yard results in oil and gas leakage while open storage doesn't have that sort of issue. Ginny Wong of the County has invited landowners to pursue the opportunity to change the zoning. Gaughan wants to do that.  Jackson asks if Gaughan's request was made before GPU was voted on. Jackson says one can't appeal zoning as part of the GPU appeals process with the Board of Supervisors if one was not on the record prior to GPU approval. Davis addresses mandated issues for flood plains. Hofler adds to that position. Davis says one must change drainage to build in flood plain. Anderson asks if a repossession yard is what we want in VC? He doesn't think so. Smith says Gaughan must have site plan and permit. Davis suggests we excuse VCCPG from this discussion until flood plain is re-designated. Gaughan is not present. Smith presented the issue to get a sense of VCCPG on the possible project and review history. No action needed.		
6.	<b>Subcommittee Reports &amp; Business:</b>	
a)	Mobility – Robert Davis, Chair.	
b)	GP Update – Richard Rudolf, Chair.	
c)	Nominations – Hans Britsch, Chair.	
d)	Northern Village – Ann Quinley, Chair.	
e)	Parks & Recreation – Brian Bachman, Chair.	

f)	Rancho Lilac – Ann Quinley, Chair. - inactive	
g)	Southern Village – Jon Vick, Chair.	
h)	Spanish Trails/Segal Ranch – Mark Jackson, Chair. - inactive	
i)	Tribal Liason – Larry Glavinic, Chair	
j)	Website – Robert Davis, Chair	
k)	Pauma Ranch – Christine Lewis, Co-Chair; LaVonne Norwood-Johnson, Co-Chair.	
l)	I-15/395 Master Planned Community [Accretive] – Steve Hutchison, Chair	
m)	Equine Ordinance - Smith, Chair	
<b>7.</b>	<b>Correspondence Received for September 12, 2011 Agenda:</b>	
a)	DPLU to VCCPG; Nickels Packing, Administrative Permit; Project number 3000-11-029 (AD 11-029) located at 29811 Miller Road near Quail Hollow Lane, Project involves the building of metal buildings for the packing and processing of citrus grown on the property; contact person is Paul Smith, IMEZ, LLC 760-751-3532 (DPLU planner is Kevin Johnston at 858-3084. (Dave Anderson for VCCPG)	
b)	DPLU to VCCPG; Swanson, Administrative Permit for Project number 3000-11-030 (AD 11-030); Second Dwelling Unit and Garage; located at 31760 N. Berry Road and Patrick Way; The project will convert an 1800 square foot metal building to a second dwelling unit with attached garage. It will include 950 sq. ft. of living space an 850 sq. ft. attached garage; 4155 sq. ft. second story an 1048 sq. ft. garage and a 44 sq. ft. covered porch. Contact person is Paul Smith 760-751-3532. DPLU planner is Kevin Johnston at 858-694-3084. (LaVonne Norwood-Johnson for VCCPG)	
c)	Laurence and Linda Nielsen to Mark Slovak with copy to VCCPG; RE: Project P11-027 Solar Orchard, LLC; Photo Voltaic Solar Project. Letter opposes installation of a solar power facility next to Vesper Grove Estates because it is incomparable with existing zoning and land use restrictions.	
d)	Trudy Konyn to VCCPG; Note of thanks for the Planning Group’s reception of Bill Lewis’s presentation of plans for the Konyn family land.	
e)	DPLU to VCCPG; Matz Commercial Bldg Site Plan “B” Designator, REPLACEMENT plan; 3500-10-013 (STP10-13). Plans for a Commercial Building at 8719 Old Castle Road, Escondido, CA; Project Contact Person is James Scott Fleming 619 743-5770. David Sibbet is DPLU planner at 858-694-3901 (Jon Vic for VCCPG)	
<b>8.</b>	<b>Motion to Adjourn:</b>	<b>9.38 pm</b>
	<b>Maker/Second:</b> Smith/Quinley	<b>Carries/Fails (Y-N-A): 11-0-0 Voice</b>
<b>Note: Next regular meeting scheduled for 14 November 2011</b>		

Appended in reference to item 5.c. above:

## VALLEY CENTER ROAD SAFETY AND/OR ROAD CAPACITY IMPROVEMENTS

Priorities approved by the Mobility Subcommittee 10/3/2011

Priorit y #	IDEA #	LOCATION	DESSCRIPTIO N	COST	DPW Feasibility/ Input	BENEFIT	SC Rationale
1.	5	Length of Valley Center Road	Timed Traffic Signals	No Additional Cost County Staff reviewing	Staff will review and adjust timing of signals		DPW is doing for free
2.	12	New Heritage Trail	Review Posts and Fencing for Sight Distance Obstructions	No Additional Cost County Staff reviewing	Necessary Action that is being Implemented by County Staff.		DPW is doing for free
3.	14	Entrance to both villages, both directions	Vehicle Speed Feedback Signs or Activated Warning Signs - 2 e/b,	\$15,000 per solar Powered Speed Feedback Sign	Feasible Actual Speed Reduction may be short lived.	Increased motorists' awareness of speed.	VCCPG voted \$60k for 4

Priorit y #	IDEA #	LOCATION	DESSCRIPTIO N	COST	DPW Feasibility/ Input	BENEFIT	SC Rationale
			2 w/b, both villages				
4.	19	Mirar de Valle/Valley Center Road Intersection	Improve n/b turn radius from Mirar de Valle onto VC Rd	\$10-20,000	Would reduce Landscaped Median. Likely not needed when intersection is signalized	Improves ability/ safety in turning left out of Mirar de Valle	Dangerou s intersectio n, already have had many accidents
5.	33	All intersection s	Add highly reflective intersection signs	\$400 per sign \$9000 total	Feasible	Adds visibility of intersection locations	Helps find streets in reduced visibility
6.	34	All intersection s	Add pre- intersection signs with name of street	\$400 per sign \$9000 total	Feasible	Adds visibility of intersection locations	Helps find streets in reduced visibility
7.	16	Valley Foods Market south of Mirar de Valle	a. Eliminat e s/b from market onto VC Rd b. Eliminat e e/b turns from VC Rd into market c. Add parallel LPR behind busines ses	\$50,000- \$100,000 for median treatment	Will require U turns at adjacent intersections to access businesses.	Improved flow on Valley Center Road. Eliminates dangerous left turns for entrance and road that are too close together.	Very dangerous . Limited solutions that do not impinge access to businesse s are hard to find. c. Added parallel road to draft Local Public Road network.
8.	24	Medical Clinic Driveway/V alley Center Road	Extend center lane in Medical Area by removing some median	\$10,000	Reduces Median	More Convenient Access to Facility. Reduces accident risk	Might change with light at Miller, however is dangerous now.
9.	32	Length of VC Rd	Add reflectors/bot dots on top of curb.	\$50,000	Can add bots dots on edge strip or centerline strip.	Bike lane currently provided through town	Helps motorists see road edge in reduced

Priorit y #	IDEA #	LOCATION	DESCRIPTIO N	COST	DPW Feasibility/ Input	BENEFIT	SC Rationale
					Provision onto of curb is not typically done and may cause confusion for motorists.	center. Little of no discernable benefit.	visibility, especially outside the villages.
10.	4	South and East Portion of Valley Center Road	Entrance Sign with Speed Limit Reminder	< \$1,000	Board Policy J-5 may conflict with sign design. MUTCD limits sign types. Redundant with speed feedback sign per item 14. Perception awareness likely fades over time.	Provides added awareness to drivers.	Identifies entrance to villages. Reinforce s speed limit.
11.	15	Woods Valley, Lilac, Cole Grade Intersection s and Miller trail crossing	Intersection and Crosswalk Treatments	Revised estimate of \$120,000 for 2 includes contracting costs – cannot sole source and contingency. \$200000 for all 4.	Feasible at Signalized intersections. Aesthetic Benefit. Ongoing Maintenance needed. Increased awareness of Crosswalk is Minor since Intersection is Signalized.	Identifies pedestrian crossings. Adds visual separation at main intersection s.	Visual change at intersection s helps reduce speeds. Use of Heritage Trail justifies use at pedestrian crossings. Do all 4 intersection s.
Estimated end of \$425,000							
12.	25	Miller Road/Valley Center Road Intersection	Traffic Signal	\$280,000	Satisfies Traffic Signal Warrants 2, 6, and 8 Developer funding depends on the timing and size of the proposed development.	Improved Right of Way Control. Improved Access to and from Miller Road and pedestrian crossing at	While perhaps needed, what is likelihood of developer funded in near future? Is a high %

Priorit y #	IDEA #	LOCATION	DESCRIPTIO N	COST	DPW Feasibility/ Input	BENEFIT	SC Rationale
						intersection .	of funding, some should come from developer.
13.	26	Cole Grade Road/Valley Center Road Intersection	Provide 500' lane east of Cole Grade	May Exceed \$425,000	Drainage Culvert Would Need to be Extended. ROW Acquisition may be needed	Improves flow and Lane Transition east of Cole Grade	Too expensive , should be done with VC East project
14.	31	East Valley Center Road	Safety Lighting at Intersections	\$6,000 for safety lighting at Mac tan and Sunset. \$60,000 for safety lighting at 10 intersections.	Feasible. Costs will vary depending on the availability of Power from SDG&E poles.	Increased visibility of intersection sat night	VCCPG does not want lighting outside of villages
15.	18	Mirar de Valle/Valley Center Road Intersection	Traffic Signal – Demand Triggered	\$350,000	Does not meet Traffic Signal Warrants Based upon current traffic volumes. Offset Traffic Signal Combined with a Proposed Future Shopping Center on East side of Road would be Feasible.	Improved Right of Way Control. Improved Access to and from Mirar de Valle and Market or Shopping Center. Provides pedestrian crossing at intersection .	Not enough volume. Uses all the \$. Should happen in time as village is developed .
16.	30	Sunset Road/Valley Center highway Intersection	Restripe pavement to add Acceleration/ Deceleration lanes	\$200,000	Requires Relocation of Power Poles  A two way left turn is provided east of the intersection. Additional	Improved Traffic Flow and Access to and from Sunset Road	Too expensive , should be done with VC East project



Priorit y #	IDEA #	LOCATION	DESCRIPTIO N	COST	DPW Feasibility/ Input	BENEFIT	SC Rationale
					accel./decl. requires additional pavement and widening.		
17.	29	Mac Tan Road/Valley Center road Intersection	Restripe pavement to add Acceleration/ Deceleration lanes	\$200,000	Requires Relocation of Power Poles. An acceleration lane can be provided striped for left turns from Mac tan onto eastbound Valley Center Road (minimal cost) A two way left turn is provided east of the intersection. Additional accel./decl. requires additional pavement and widening.	Improved Traffic Flow and Access to and from Mac Tan Road	Too expensive , should be done with VC East project
18.	7	Ridge Ranch/Valle y Center Road Intersection	a. Traffic Signal b. Eliminat e s/b turn from RR to VC Rd.	a. \$350,0 00	a. Infeasibl e - Does not Meet Traffic Signal Warrant s b. Infeasibl e – In order to prevent the left turn, a hard median would need to be		Not supported by DPW Very expensive

Priorit y #	IDEA #	LOCATION	DESCRIPTIO N	COST	DPW Feasibility/ Input	BENEFIT	SC Rationale
					provided and we would not want to do that at this location since it is outside of the town center and the first one they come to - it would be unexpected.		
19.	8	Ridge Ranch/Valley Center Road Intersection	Turn Pockets for E/B and W/B	Likely to exceed \$450,000	Requires Right of way Acquisition	Marginal Benefit – Improves Access for Residents on Ridge Ranch and Bypass on Valley Center Road	Uses all the \$
20.	28	Vesper Road/Valley Center Road Intersection	a. Turn Pockets , Blind Curve, improve right turn from Valley Center  b. Restripe to add left turn lane e/b from VC Rd	Well Exceeds \$425,000	Steep Grade on Southern side of road with Private Driveway Right of way Acquisition needed and Detailed Design.	Adequate sight distance is available in the w/b direction. Can Intersection Warning sign be added E/B? Intersection warning sign is not recommended. Would lead to disregard	Intersection Warning sign for W/B Approach will be Installed.  Restriping is too expensive , should be done with VC East project

Priorit y #	IDEA #	LOCATION	DESSCRIPTIO N	COST	DPW Feasibility/ Input	BENEFIT	SC Rationale
						on needed warning signs.	
21.	9	Banbury/Val ley Center Road Intersection	Turn Pockets for E/B and W/B on Banbury	Likely to exceed \$450,000	Requires Right of way Acquisition Marginal Benefit –	Improves Access for Residents on Banbury and Bypass on Valley Center Road	High \$\$
22.	10	Banbury/Val ley Center Road Intersection	Right Turn pocket/accel lane for S/B on VC Rd	Likely to exceed \$450,000	Requires Right of way Acquisition Marginal Benefit	Improves Egress for Residents on Ridge Ranch	High \$\$
23.	11	Woods Valley to Banbury	Pathway on west side	Likely to exceed \$450,000	Drainage structures in area where Trail is Proposed and would need to be Redesigned and located. Right of way Acquisition may be required.	Extension of Pedestrian Path	High \$\$
24.	22	Old Road/Valley Center Road Intersection	Traffic Signal	\$350,000	Does not meet Traffic Signal Warrants Based upon current traffic volumes.		Not enough volume. Uses all the \$
25.	6	Various Locations	Flashing In- Pavement Pedestrian Crossings	\$35,000 per pedestrian crossing	Infeasible - Would not install at uncontrolled or signalized intersections		Agree with DPW
26.	35	Length of VC Rd	Paint speed markings	Minimal cost	Not typical installation	No perceivable benefit. Motorists will ignore	Agree with DPW and it's ugly
27.	37	Entrance to both villages –	Paint chevrons	Minimal cost	Not typical installation. Would not	No perceivable benefit.	Agree with DPW and it's ugly

Priorit y #	IDEA #	LOCATION	DESCRIPTIO N	COST	DPW Feasibility/ Input	BENEFIT	SC Rationale
		n/b and s/b			want to place warning device will no evident hazard	Motorists will ignore	
28.	36	Entrance to both villages – n/b and s/b	2 Speed tables	\$20,000 each	Infeasible. Speed tables typically only provided on roads with speed 30 mph or less. Prevailing speed > 45 mph. Fire Dept concerns	Motorists will reduce their speed in the vicinity of the speed tables.	Speed limits too high to be feasible.
29.	20	South Village	Median treatment – add Color	\$100,000	Increased Maintenance Costs are not Addressed	Aesthetic Benefit	Not enough payback
30.	17	Mirar de Valle/Valley Center Road Intersection	Roundabout	Well Exceeds \$425,000	Detailed Engineering Design Required. Right of way Acquisition Required.	Slows down traffic	Uses all the \$ Need communit y discussion / consensu s on roundabo uts
31.	27	Vesper Road/Valley Center Road Intersection	Roundabout	Well Exceeds \$425,000	Detailed Engineering Design Required. Right of way Acquisition Required.	Slows down traffic	Uses all the \$ Need communit y discussion / consensu s on roundabo uts
32.	1	General Suggestion	Traffic Engineering Study to Recommend Projects	\$50,000- 100,000	Does not appear that studies are eligible per agreement	Added input and perhaps some additional options to consider	No \$ in this agreement
33.	2	General	Provide	\$100,000	Does not	CHP	no \$ in

Priority #	IDEA #	LOCATION	DESCRIPTION	COST	DPW Feasibility/ Input	BENEFIT	SC Rationale
		Suggestion	\$100,000 to CHP for Added Enforcement		appear that studies are eligible per agreement	enforces speed to extent allowed.	this agreement
34.	3	Bottom of Grade on Valley Center Road	Widen to 4 lanes	Well exceeds \$425,000	Full EIR and Preliminary Engineering Study Required	Long Term Benefit Traffic Flows Freely at this time.	Escondido to do
35.	13	North Bound north of Woods Valley Road	Road Texturing for Speed Awareness	Costs will vary depending upon Treatment and extent of Treatment	Texturing may increase noise in commercial and pedestrian areas and increase ongoing maintenance costs.	Texturing may be Ineffective in Reducing Speeds	Too noisy
36.	21	North of South Village	Increase Speed Limit	Minimal Cost	Regulatory Action and not an improvement . TAC considers speed limits based upon Vehicle Code req'ts	Unknown Benefit	Opposite of goal
37.	23	Canyon Road/Valley Center Road	Left Turn Lane where Coffee Van Parks	\$100,000	Reduces Median	More Convenient Access to Facility	Already one at other end of Canyon Rd